

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 17 May 2006. Responsive to that Office Action, Claims 2, 10, and 18 have now been canceled from this case, and Claims 1-5, 9, 11-12, and 17 have been amended for further prosecution with the other pending Claims. It is believed that with such Amendment of Claims, there is a further clarification of their recitations.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4, 8-9, 13, 16-17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Shu reference. The Examiner also rejected Claims 6-7, 14-15, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shu in view of the Tseng British reference. Further, the Examiner rejected Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shu in view of the Chang reference.


As for Claims 2-3, 5, 10-12, and 18, the Examiner merely objected to those Claims for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. Accordingly, each of the Claims 5 and 12 has been amended to independent form, incorporating therein the subject matter of their respective base and any intervening claims. In addition, the subject matter of Claim 2 has been incorporated into its base Claim 1; the subject matter of Claim 10 has been incorporated into its base Claim 9; and, the subject matter of Claim 18 has been incorporated into its base Claim 17, with Claims 2, 10, and 18 being canceled, and the dependencies of certain other Claims being adjusted appropriately. Certain other corrections have been incorporated into the Claims to remove obvious typographic informalities incidentally noted by the undersigned Attorney.

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending independent Claims 1, 5, 9, 12, and 17 as well as the remaining Claims which depend therefrom are, therefore, in allowable form.

The amendments hereby incorporated into the Claims are made in the interests of expediting prosecution of this case, given the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Such amendments of Claims are made, moreover, without addressing the merits of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject Patent Application has now been placed fully in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



Jun Y. Lee
Registration #40,262

Dated: *16 Aug. 2006*

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586